DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 805 CG 023 109

AUTHOR Clark, Burton A.
TITLE Comparison of Group Climate Scores between Executives from Functional and Dysfunctional Families of Origin.
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Executive Fire Officer Conference (Fort Worth, TX, October 22-25, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; *Family Characteristics; *Group Experience; Males; *Postsecondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Dysfunctional Families; *Family of Origin; *National Fire Academy

ABSTRACT

A major portion of the National Fire Academy (NFA) executive development curriculum includes group process and team building instruction. This material does not contain any information on the family of origin and its potential impact on the group process and team building capabilities of adults. This study examined whether there was a significant difference in group climate questionnaire scores between fire executives from functional and dysfunctional families of origin. A total of 70 Executive Fire Officer Program graduates participated in the study. Subjects were classified as functional (N=45) or dysfunctional (N=25), based on their scores on the Family of Origin Questionnaire. The mean scores for each of the seven items on the Group Climate Questionnaire were compared between the functional and dysfunctional groups and the overall mean scores were also compared using an unpaired t-test. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in six of the seven mean scores. The "risk taking" item had the only significant difference. The overall mean for the functional group was 4.911 while the dysfunctional group overall mean was 4.566; the difference was statistically significant. These findings suggest that the family of origin experience does influence group dynamics. Developmental activities need to include family of origin instructional methodologies to help groups become more effective. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327805

COMPARISON OF GROUP CLIMATE SCORES BETWEEN EXECUTIVES FROM FUNCTIONAL AND DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILIES OF ORIGIN

by

Burton A. Clark, M.A.

National Fire Academy

Presented at the Society of Executive Fire Officer Conference

Fort Worth, TX

October 22-25, 1989

C6023109

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Burton A. Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The problem was that the National Fire Academy faculty did not know if a students work group climate is negatively or positively influenced by their family of origin experience. The purpose of this study was to compare the group climate scores of students from functional and dysfunctional families of origin.

A total of seventy Executive Fire Officer Program graduates participated in the study. The procedures included classifying the students into two groups functional (N=45) and dysfunctional (N=25). The classification was made by using the Family of Origin Questionnaire. Each group was also surveyed with the Group Climate Questionnaire. The mean scores for each of the seven items on the Group Climate Questionnaire were compared between the functional and dysfunctional group and the overall mean scores were also compared using an unpaired t test.

The results indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in six of the seven mean scores. The "risk taking" item had the only significant difference. The functional group mean was 5.2 and the dysfunctional group mean was 4.52, $P \leq .05$.

The overall mean for the functional group was 4.911 the dysfunctional group overall mean was 4.566; the difference is statistically significant at $P \leq .01$.

The conclusion was that the family of origin experience does influence group dynamics. Developmental activities need to include family of origin instructional methodologies to help groups become more effective.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Group Climate Questionnaire Item Results for Fire Executives From Functional Families of Origin	12
2.	Group Climate Questionnaire Item Results for Fire Executives From Dysfunctional Families of Origin	13
3.	Comparison of Group Climate Questionnaire Item Means Between Functional and Dysfunctional Groups	14
4.	Comparison of Mean Scores Between the Functional and Dysfunctional Groups	14
5.	Bad Feeling Identified by Percentage of Group	15
6.	Response to Family of Origin Questions by Dysfunctional Group N=25	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	1
Significance	1
Literature Review	2
PROCEDURES	6
Population	6
Instrumentation	7
Collection of Data	8
Statistical Analysis	8
Assumptions and Limitations	9
Definitions of Terms	10
RESULTS	11
DISCUSSION	16
CONCLUSION	17
REFERENCES	18

5 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

		Page
APPENDICIES		20
A.	GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE	21
B.	FAMILY OF ORIGIN QUESTIONNAIRE	23
C.	COVER LETTER	25

INTRODUCTION

A major portion of the National Fire Academy (NFA) executive development curriculum includes group process and team building instruction. This material does not presently contain any information on the family of origin and its potential impact on the group process and team building capabilities of adults. The problem is that NFA faculty do not know if a student's work group climate is negatively or positively influenced by their family of origin experience. The purpose of this practicum is to compare the group climate scores of students from functional and dysfunctional families of origin.

A descriptive research method of investigation was used for this study. The research question was: Is there a significant difference in group climate questionnaire scores between fire executives from functional and dysfunctional families of origin. There were 45 students in the functional group and 25 in the dysfunctional group.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Significance

The NFA Fire Executive Development course is scheduled to undergo revisions. Part of the revision process will concentrate on the group process and team building modules of the course, which account for one third of the course content. The present course content does not contain any information on the family of origin and

its impact on an adults ability to work in groups and teams. NFA management must decide if family of origin information needs to be included in the revised course materials. The information from this study will be used in the decision making process.

In addition, this study is important because it is the first quantitative student needs assessment to relate early life experiences to present day learning needs. The methodology used in this study will serve as a model for future student needs assessment projects.

Literature Review

The literature reviewed for this study covered three areas; early childhood development, characteristics of functional and dysfunctional families, and group process. More specifically, how an individuals learning experience, in their family of origin, can positively or negatively influence their group process abilities in adult life.

There are many concepts to be learned as part of an individuals early childhood development. The concepts related to this study are trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, identity, and intimacy; which are the first six stages in Erikson's (1963) eight psychosocial stages of human development. There are two underlying assumptions to the stages:

> 1. That the human personality, in principle, develops according to steps predetermined in the growing person's readiness to be driven toward, to be aware of, and to interact with, a widening social radius.
>
> 2. That society, in principle, tends to be so constituted as to meet and invite this succession of potentialities for interaction and attempts to safeguard and encourage a proper rate and proper sequence of their unfolding. (Ibid: 270)

Erikson's psychosocial stages represent important concepts that people learn early in life from their family of origin. The stages are "...turning points, moments of decision between progress and regression, integration and retardation" (Ibid: 271). For parents to be competent in helping their children through these various stages they need to use a variety of child guiding approaches, but all approaches must "...focus on fostering the emotional needs of both the parents and children" (Bigner, 1979: 21). To meet the emotional needs of the child there must be a consistency, continuity and sameness of the care given to the child (Erikson, 1963: 247).

For the family to be functional and meet the psychological needs of the child, Dyer (1975) indicates that three processes need to be in place. First, there needs to be effective communications. For family communications to be effective the members must be able to continually reexamine their assumptions about each other, take risks in expressing themselves, and foster understanding. This can only be achieved by continually practicing the communications process. Second, there needs to be a basis for trust among family members which is based on honesty, caring, mutual confidence, and openness.

Third, the complete spectrum of feelings must be accepted and revealed by the members. Families become dysfunctional when one or more of these processes are not present. The basic rules that are directly or indirectly taught to children in dysfunctional families are don't talk, don't trust, and don't feel (Kritsberg, 1985; Whitfield, 1987; and Woititz, 1985).

Dysfunctional families are caused by adult problems which result from alcoholism, drug addiction, physical abuse, psychological abuse, sexual abuse, or any other situation which does not permit the family to be child centered. Whitfield (1987: 2) estimates "...that from 80 to 95% of people did not receive the love, guidance, and other nurturing necessary to form consistently healthy relationships, and feel good about themselves and about what they do."

Kritsberg's (1985: 50) model of the family process illustrates the differences between how functional and dysfunctional families process shock events, which children experience as a natural part of their development. When a child experiences a shock event their feelings shut down and they experience disequilibrium. Then there is a rebound stage; when feelings start to reemerge. The resolution stage is next, in which the child tries to resolve these feelings in order to restore the equilibrium.

Functional and dysfunctional families help the child through this process differently. In the dysfunctional family, there is silence about the shock event, which forces the child to interpret what the trauma means. The family is disorganized and members do not support each other. Family members do not talk to anyone about the event, which results in unresolved shock in the child. Functional

families handle the shock event differently. They talk about it openly, there is family support and love, and emotional discharge is allowed to accrue. All of this allows the shock event to be resolved and incorporated into the childs developmental processes.

Knowles (1972: 33) ties the literature of early childhood development, and family of origin together; then relates it to group process when he states, "...the attitudes, values, and habits developed in the first group in a persons life - the family - may strongly influence his feelings and behavior toward leaders and authority and toward other group members." Work groups develop their own unique characteristics. Both McGregor and Likert identified the characteristics of effective work groups. Their lists have the following similar aspects. Effective groups have a comfortable and relaxed atmosphere, there is open communications, disagreement is encouraged, feelings are expressed, and members trust, support, and help each other (Burke, 1982).

To summarize the literature, an individuals ability to work in a group is influenced by their past experience, emotional tendencies, and psychological needs (Knowles, 1972). All of which are shaped at a very early age by the family environment a person grows up in. The literature that was reviewed supports this summary, but there were no quantitative studies found that compared the family environment to the later adult work group environment.

PROCEDURES

Population

The participants were students attending the NFA Executive Fire Officer Graduate Symposium. These students were graduates of the NFA executive fire officer program, which has a total population of 415. Invitations were sent to the entire population and 93 attended the symposium. The number of students was limited, due to NFA budget restrictions. Students were selected on a first come first serve basis.

The group was male between the ages of 35 and 55; and were chief fire executives from around the country. The participants voluntarily applied to attend the symposium and selection was made by the admissions office.

This group was selected to study by NFA management because they represent the students most highly trained in group process and team building by the NFA. The symposium was selected because it was the environment in which the largest number of graduates were together. In addition, this group of students was considered as one class in terms of data collection; any testing of students beyond this requires Office of Management and Budget approval which takes 12 months and was beyond the timelines of this study.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used as part of this study. The Group Climate Questionnaire was developed by University Associates (Appendix A). It is designed to be used by work groups to help them identify their effective and ineffective group characteristics. Instructions for its use indicated that group members answer the questions anonymously, the mean score for each item is calculated, the results are reported to the group, and the group uses the data to identify their strengths and weaknesses (Francis and Young, 1979). This instrument was selected because the items match the concepts which are critical to group effectiveness, the concepts are described in detail, and the concepts were taught in the NFA executive development curriculum.

The second instrument used was the Family of Origin Questionnaire which was developed by the Institute for Counseling and Training (Appendix B). This questionnaire was developed as part of a study to identify differences between employees from functional and dysfunctional families of origin. It was selected because the individuals who answer yes to any of the questions can identify with some or all of the characteristics of growing up in a dysfunctional home (Woititz, 1987).

Collection of Data

The group climate questionnaire and family of origin questionnaire were distributed to students attending the symposium. Both questionnaires were printed on the same sheet of paper, two sided copying. The instrument was included in the students registration packet, which they received on Saturday, the day of arrival. A cover letter was attached to the instrument along with a return envelope (Appendix C). Students were asked to complete the instrument, place it in the envelope, and deposit it in a marked box outside the auditorium on Sunday.

The family of origin questionnaire was used to place respondents in the functional or dysfunctional group. An answer of yes to any of the eight questions placed the group climate questionnaire in the dysfunctional group. All others, or all no response, were placed in the functional group.

The scores between the functional and dysfunctional groups were compared for each of the seven group climate questions. In addition, the overall mean scores were compared between groups.

Statistical Analysis

An unpaired t test was calculated for each of the seven questions on the group climate questionnaire for the functional and dysfunctional groups and the overall mean score. This was a one tailed test at the .10 level of significance. This statistical method was

chosen because of the limited number of cases, the fact that this study is a preliminary investigation, and to reduce the chance of committing a type II error.

Null hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the group climate scores of the functional and dysfunctional groups.

Alternative hypothesis (a): The functional group will have statistically significant higher group climate scores then the dysfunctional group.

Alternative hypothesis (b): The dysfunctional group will have statistically significant higher group climate scores then the functional group.

Assumptions and Limitations

There are six assumptions to be considered. First, it was assumed that the students answered the family of origin questionnaire honestly. The questions are of a personal nature and are not typically discussed in casual conversation. To help ensure honest responses the instrument was anonymous, the students filled it out in privacy, and placed it in an envelope. Second, it was assumed that the students have a homogeneous comprehension of the concepts in the group climate questionnaire. The concepts addressed in the questionnaire were taught to all the students in the fire executive development course. Third, the perception of the students was assumed to be an accurate evaluation of their work teams. Fourth, a yes response on the family of origin questionnaire

was assumed to indicate that the student experienced some of the characteristics of growing up in a dysfunctional family. Fifth, it was assumed that the cover letter and the questionnaires were clear and reflect the intent of this study. Finally, it was assumed that the sample is representative of the total population.

A limitation of this study was the classification of the student as being from a functional or dysfunctional family of origin. Detailed family history, through interview and questionnaire techniques, are needed for completely accurate classification. That type of indepth investigation was beyond the scope of this preliminary study.

Definitions of Terms

The National Fire Academy is part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency which is under the executive branch of the federal government.

Fire Executive Development Course - This is a two week 80 hour course designed for chief fire executives from around the country. It is the first course taken by students in the Executive Fire Officer Program.

Executive Fire Officer Program - is a series of four courses taken over a four year period by chief fire executives. The entrance requirement is that students must be members of their top management team.

Dysfunctional Group - respondents that answer yes to one or more of the questions on the Family of Origin portion of the questionnaire.

Functional Group - respondents that answer no to all the questions on the Family of Origin portion of the questionnaire.

RESULTS

A total of seventy questionnaires were received from the students, which equals a 75% return rate. Twenty-five students answered yes to one or more of the questions on the Family of Origin portion of the questionnaire and forty-five students answered no to all the questions. The Group Climate Questionnaires were classified into two groups functional (N=45) and dysfunctional (N=25).

The mean, standard deviation, score range, and standard error of measure was calculated for each of the seven items on the Group Climate Questionnaire. The results for the functional group indicates that risk taking had the highest mean 5.2 and openness had the lowest mean 4.622. Standard deviations ranged from 1.195 for shared values to 1.502 for risk taking and the highest standard error of measure was risk taking at .224 and shared values had the lowest at .178 (Table 1).

TABLE 1

GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM RESULTS FOR FIRE EXECUTIVES FROM FUNCTIONAL FAMILIES OF ORIGIN

Item	$\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	Low	High	Standard Error of Measure
Openness	4.622	1.403	1	7	.209
Conformity	5.178	1.211	1	7	.181
Support	4.889	1.369	2	7	.204
Confronting Difficulties	5.044	1.261	2	7	.204
Risk Taking	5.2	1.502	1	7	.224
Shared Values	4.733	1.195	2	7	.178
Energy	4.711	1.456	1	7	.217

Note: N=45

Descriptive statistics were also calculated for the dysfunctional group. Shared values had the highest item mean at 4.8 and energy had the lowest at 4.28. The highest standard deviation was 1.763 for conformity and shared values had the lowest at 1.19. Shared values also had the lowest standard error of measure at .238 and conformity had the highest at .353 (Table 2).

TABLE 2

GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM RESULTS FOR FIRE EXECUTIVES FROM DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILIES OF ORIGIN

Item	$\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	Low	High	Standard Error of Measure
Openness	4.44	1.66	1	6	.332
Conformity	4.76	1.763	1	7	.353
Support	4.48	1.358	1	6	.272
Confronting Difficulties	4.68	1.749	1	7	.35
Risk Taking	4.52	1.759	1	7	.352
Shared Values	4.8	1.19	2	6	.238
Energy	4.28	1.458	1	6	.292

Note: N=25

The functional and dysfunctional group mean scores were compared, using an unpaired t test, for each of the seven items on the Group Climate Questionnaire. There was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the following six items; openness, conformity, support, confronting difficulties, shared values, and energy. The mean scores for the risk taking item were 5.2 for the functional group and 4.52 for the dysfunctional group, the difference is significant at $P \leq .05$ (Table 3).

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM MEANS BETWEEN FUNCTIONAL AND DYSFUNCTIONAL GROUPS

Item	Mean Functional[a]	Mean Dysfunctional[b]	Calculated t value
Openness	4.622	4.44	.487
Conformity	5.178	4.76	1.171
Support	4.889	4.48	1.201
Confronting Difficulties	5.044	4.68	1.006
Risk Taking	5.2	4.52	1.707*
Shared Values	4.733	4.8	.224
Energy	4.711	4.28	1.186

[a]N=45

[b]N=25

*Statistically significant at P≤.05.

The overall mean scores for the functional and dysfunctional groups were compared using an unpaired t test. The functional group mean was 4.911 and the dysfunctional group mean was 4.566; this is statistically significant at P≤.01 (Table 4).

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN THE FUNCTIONAL AND DYSFUNCTIONAL GROUPS

Group	N	$\overline{X}$*	Score Low	Score High	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Measure
Functional	7	4.911	4.622	5.2	.234	.088
Dysfunctional	7	4.566	4.28	4.8	.188	.071

*Statistically significant difference between means P≤.01.

Both groups identified "frustration" as the bad feeling they most often have, 37% functional, 60% dysfunctional. Anger and fear of rejection received no response from either group (Table 5).

TABLE 5

BAD FEELING IDENTIFIED BY PERCENTAGE OF GROUP

Bad Feeling	Functional %	Dysfunctional %
Inadequacy	4	4
Anger	0	0
Lack of Control	15	16
Unappreciated	15	0
Bored	2	0
Perfectionism	6	8
Lack of Recognition	4	8
Frustration	37	60
Fear of Rejection	0	0
Other	8	4
None	4	0

The dysfunctional group identified parent or grandparent alcohol or drug abuse most often 64%. Brother, sister, or child alcohol/drug abuse was second with 44% (Table 6).

TABLE 6

RESPONSE TO FAMILY OF ORIGIN QUESTIONS BY DYSFUNCTIONAL GROUP N=25

Family of Origin	N	%
Parent/Grandparent - alcohol/drugs	16	64
Brother/Sister/Child - alcohol/drugs	11	44
Chronic Illness	7	28
Adopted	4	16
Foster Care	1	4
Abused	1	4
Profoundly Religious	6	24
Military Brat	1	4

DISCUSSION

The null hypothesis is accepted for six of the seven items on the Group Climate Questionnaire. There was no statistically significant difference between fire executives from functional or dysfunctional families of origin. For the risk taking item, alternative hypothesis (a) is accepted. The functional group mean was significantly higher at $P \leq .05$. The null hypothesis is rejected when comparing the overall mean scores; alternative hypothesis (a) is accepted. The functional groups mean score was significantly higher then the dysfunctional group $P \leq .01$.

This study was a preliminary investigation, the results do indicate that the family of origin does influence adult group process and team building. The concept of trust, the ability to communicate, and the expression of feelings are learned at an early age in the

family of origin. These concepts and skills are not typically taught in school systems or work environments. This has consequences for individuals from dysfunctional families of origin. The extent of the consequences and the exact nature of the consequences remain to be studied.

CONCLUSION

This study supports the theories of Knowles (1972), Woititz (1986), Whitfield (1987), and Burke (1982) which all indicate that the family of origin experience influences adult group behavior.

The implication is that group process and team building training and development activities need to include instructional methodologies that address the family of origin and its impact on the participants. This information may help participants identify why they behave and feel the way they do with their work group. The group may use the information to make their process more efficient and effective.

REFERENCES

Bigner, Jerry J. Parent-Child Relations an Introduction to Parenting. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979.

Burke, W. Warner. Organizational Development Principles and Practices. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1982.

Cross, Patricia K. Adults as Learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1981.

Dyer, William G. Creating Closer Families Principles of Positive Family Interaction. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1975.

Dyer, William G. Team Building: Issues and Alternatives. Reading, Massachusetts: Anderson-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.

Francis, Dave, and Young, Don. Improving Work Groups. San Diego, California: University Associates, 1979.

Knowles, Malcolm and Knowles, Hulda. Introduction to Group Dynamics. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1972.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. Chicago: Follett Publishing Co., 1980.

Kritsberg, Wayne. The Adult Children of Alcoholic Syndrome. Pompano Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1985.

McConnell, James V. Understanding Human Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1989.

Whitfield, Charles L. Healing the Child Within. Deerfield Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1987.

Woititz, Janet G. Adult Children of Alcoholics. Pompano Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1985.

Woititz, Janet G. Home Away From Home. Pompano Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1987.

Wortitz, Janet G. Struggle for Intimacy. Pompano Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1986.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

GROUP CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please give your candid opinions of your Top Management team by rating its characteristics on the seven-point scales shown below. Circle the appropriate number on each scale to represent your evaluation.

Openness. Are individuals open in their transactions with others? Are there hidden agendas? Are some topics taboo for discussion within the group? Can team members express their feelings about others openly without offense?

Individuals are very guarded	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Individuals are very open

Conformity. Does the group have rules, procedures, policies, and traditions that are preventing it from working effectively? Are the ideas of senior members considered as law? Can individuals freely express unusual or unpopular views?

Rigid conformity to an inappropriate pattern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Open group with a flexible pattern

Support. Do team members pull for one another? What happens when an individual makes a mistake? Do members who are strong expend energy in helping members who are less experienced or less capable?

Little help for individuals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	High level support for individuals

Confronting Difficulties. Are difficult or uncomfortable issues openly worked through? Are conflicts confronted or swept under the carpet? Can team members openly disagree with the team manager? Does the team devote much energy to thoroughly working through difficulties?

Difficult issues are avoided	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Problems are attacked openly and directly.

Risk Taking. Do individuals feel that they can try new things, risk failure, and still get support? Does the team positively encourage people to extend themselves?

Risk taking in work not encourages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Experimentation and personal exploration are the norm

Shared Values. Have team members worked through their own values with others? Is time spent on considering the cause (Why?) as well as the effect (What?)? Is there a fundamental set of values shared by team members?

No basis of common values	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Large area of common ground.

Energy. Do team members put sufficient energy into working on relationships with others? Does team membership act as a stimulus and energizer to individuals?

Little energy directed toward team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	High level of positive energy

From: Improving Work Groups, Dave Francis and Don Young; University Associates, 1979.

APPENDIX B

FAMILY OF ORIGIN QUESTIONNAIRE

FAMILY OF ORIGIN

Do/did you have a parent or grandparent who abused alcohol or drugs? YES ___ NO ___

Do/did you have a brother, sister, or child who abused alcohol or drugs? YES ___ NO ___

Do/did you live with chronic illness? YES ___ NO ___

Were you adopted? YES ___ NO ___

Were you in foster care? YES ___ NO ___

Were you physically or emotionally abused? YES ___ NO ___

Was your family profoundly religious? YES ___ NO ___

Were you an "Military Brat"? YES ___ NO ___

What is the one bad feeling you have most often on the Team? (Check One)

___ Inadequacy

___ Anger

___ Lack of Control

___ Unappreciated

___ Bored

___ Perfectionism

___ Lack of Recognition

___ Frustration

___ Fear of Rejection

___ Other _____
Please write

___ None of the Above

Adopted From: Woititz, Janet G. Home Away From Home. Pompano Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc., 1987.

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

Federal Emergency Management Agency

National Fire Academy
Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727

Dear EFO Graduate:

Enclosed is a questionnaire. This information will help me in my research on the "Family of Origin and Its Impact on Group Process." Your personal responses are completely confidential. It will take about 10 minutes to answer the questions.

Please fill out the questionnaire, put it in the envelope and put it in the box marked Clark's Questionnaire that will be in the lobby outside "J" Building auditorium on Sunday morning. Please drop it off by the end of the first break.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you would like a copy of the results, please write me at the above address or call me at (301) 447-1069.

Sincerely,

Burton A. Clark
Management Science Program Chair
National Fire Academy

Enclosure